

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 LACRISHA MARTIN, also known as  
12 TSHAUNA BROWN,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 KIM DO, et al.,

16 Defendants.  
17

No. 2:22-CV-1781-TLN-DMC-P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

18 Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to  
19 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 25, 2023, the Court determined that Plaintiff's first amended  
20 complaint was appropriate for service and directed Plaintiff to submit documents for service by  
21 the United States Marshal within 30 days. Plaintiff was warned that failure to submit the required  
22 documents may result in dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution and failure to comply  
23 with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110. To date, Plaintiff has not complied.

24 The Court must weigh five factors before imposing the harsh sanction of dismissal.  
25 See Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); Malone v. U.S. Postal  
26 Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987). Those factors are: (1) the public's interest in  
27 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its own docket; (3) the risk of  
28 prejudice to opposing parties; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits;

1 and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. See id.; see also Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52,  
2 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an appropriate  
3 sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor. See Malone,  
4 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is appropriate where  
5 there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.  
6 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to comply with an  
7 order to file an amended complaint. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
8 1992).

9 Having considered these factors, and in light of Plaintiff's failure to submit service  
10 documents as directed, the Court finds that dismissal of this action is appropriate.

11 Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that this action be dismissed,  
12 without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders.

13 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
14 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days  
15 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
16 objections with the court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of  
17 objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal. See  
18 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

19  
20 Dated: March 17, 2023



21 DENNIS M. COTA  
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28